UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,043	10/13/2005	Xin Lu	5585-69856-01	6728
	7590 03/26/200 SPARKMAN, LLP	EXAMINER		
121 SW SALM		AEDER, SEAN E		
SUITE 1600 PORTLAND, C	OR 97204		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1642	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/522,043	LU ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
SEAN E. AEDER	1642	

	SEAN E. AEDER	1042	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 22 February 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of).		
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS	unit the time period set forth in 57	Of 10 41.57 (a).	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	sideration and/or search (see NO		cause
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belown) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or 	**	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mphane / monamone (1 02 02 1).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 1-3,8,11-14,57,58 and 60. Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 59. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/MISOOK YU/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1642	
	i fillary Examinor, Art o	IIIC 1072	

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph; the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b); and the rejection of claims 1, 8, 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Claim 59 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement, for the reasons stated in the Office Action of 10/5/07 and for the reasons set-forth below. In the reply of 2/22/08, Applicant states that claim 59 had not been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Applicant further points-out that claim 59 has a limitation of at least 95% identity to a sequence. The arguments found in the Reply of 2/22/08 have been carefully considered, but are not deemed persuasive. In regards to the statement that claim 59 had not been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph, claim 59 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph (see first line of page 3 of the Office Action of 10/5/07). Further, following Example 14 of the Written Description Guidelines, it is noted that claims reciting 95% homology AND a function were not rejected for lacking written description. However, following Example 13 of the Written Description Guidelines, claims drawn to variants that lack recitation of a function were rejected.